

REMARKS

Summary of the Present Amendment

Upon entry of the above amendment, independent claims 33, 46 and 51 are amended. Accordingly, claims 33, 34, and 37-60 currently remain pending in this application.

Summary of the Official Action

In the instant office action, the office has rejected claims 33, 34, and 37-60 over the art of record. More particularly, claims 33, 34, 37-45, 60 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 33, 34, 38-40, 43-45, 47-49, 51-53, 56-58, 60 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Published Application No. 2006/0287068 to Walker et al. ("*Walker*") in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0229682 to Gelinotte ("*Gelinotte*") (Note: claims 37, 41, 42, 46, 50, 54, 55 and 59 were not listed in the header setting forth the rejection, but were included in the body of the rejection). By present amendment and remarks, the Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome, and respectfully request reconsideration of the Office Action and allowance of claims 33, 34, and 37-60 of the present application.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 33, 34, 37-45, 60 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In particular, the Office Action took issue with claim 33, which recited the limitation "permits rapid authentication of the gaming chips by comparison of the total value displayed with the value mentally calculated by an operator." Applicant has amended claim 33 to remove the phrase "by comparison of the total value displayed with the value mentally calculated by an operator." By the amendment to claim 33, the §112, first paragraph rejection has been traversed. Favorable treatment is respectfully requested.

Traversal of the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 33, 34, 38-40, 43-45, 47-49, 51-53, 56-58, 60 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable *Walker* in view of *Gelinotte* (Note: claims 37, 41, 42, 46, 50, 54, 55 and 59 were not listed in the rejection but were included in the body of the rejection). Claims 33, 46 and 51 have been amended to include the elements of (i) overlapping antennas in the reading area and (ii) a gaming chip testing area that is placed on the tabletop adjacent the gaming chip storage area in reach and in view of an operator and out of a typical reach of a customer. The overlapping antennas are also recited as "fixed to a surface of the gaming tabletop" and "configured to surround the gaming chip testing area." The overlapping antenna configuration and positioning of the gaming chip testing area as recited in independent claims 33, 46 and 51 are neither taught nor suggested in the *Walker* or *Gelinotte* references.

Claims 33, 46 and 51 specifically recite overlapping antennas where both antennas are fixed to the surface of the table top and the antennas are configured to surround the gaming chip testing area, which is not taught in either *Walker* or *Gelinotte*, and is also not shown in the combination of *Walker* and *Gelinotte* or any other combination of the art of record. *Walker* shows that the interrogator associated with a wager area and a bankroll area respectively has a single antenna. *See Walker*, FIG. 8, elements 158A and 158B (Illustrating the antenna by a single dashed line around the wager area and the bankroll area). Applicant submits that a single antenna associated with a wager area 150 and bankroll area 146 illustrated and described in *Walker* fails to teach or suggest the overlapping antenna arrangement on the surface of the gaming tabletop as recited in amended independent claims 33, 46 and 51. *Gelinotte* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Walker*.

Moreover, the location of both the screen and the gaming chip testing area (ergonomics) are important to the operation of the table. Accordingly, in addition to similar amendments made previously for the placement of the display device, claims 33, 46 and 51 have been modified to specify that the gaming chip testing area is placed on the tabletop adjacent the gaming chip testing area in reach and in view of an operator. Further, the gaming chip testing area is placed out of a typical reach of a customer. In contrast to the position of the starting switch of *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 U.S.P.Q. 70 (CCPA 1950), the position of the display and gaming chip testing area is critical to the operation of the tabletop. The location of both the display and the gaming chip testing area allows the dealer to keep her eyes on the table and thus prevent players from cheating, which is an important aspect of the presently claimed invention.

Walker and *Gelinotte* simply fail to teach or suggest the combination of a gaming chip testing area and display device that are within the reach and in view of an operator. As stated previously, FIG. 8 of *Walker* illustrates a display (142) located away from the tabletop, at a location which would be directly to the right of the croupier or dealer, and which is not in or on the tabletop. *Gelinotte* fails to cure the deficiency of the *Walker* reference. Moreover, FIG. 8 of *Walker* also illustrates a number of interrogators that can read the wager area and the bankroll area of the player, however, each of the areas is within the reach of the player. The claimed gaming chip storage area of claims 33, 46 and 51 are recited as "out of a typical reach of a customer" at the gaming table. Therefore, claims 33, 46 and 51 each recite a gaming chip testing area that is not taught or suggested in the *Walker* reference. Again, *Gelinotte* fails to cure the deficiency of the *Walker* reference. Accordingly, the Applicants argue that the combination of the ergonomic positioning of the display and the gaming chip testing area as claimed define over the art of record.

It is believed that the present amendment to the claims successfully traverses the §103(a) rejection based upon *Walker* and *Gelinotte* for independent claims 33, 46 and 51. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 34, 37-45, 47-50, and 52-60 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present invention. Favorable treatment in the form of a notice of allowance is therefore requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious the Applicants' invention, as recited in each of claims 33, 34, and 37-60. The applied references have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of record have been pointed out.

Accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment, please contact the undersigned at 702-464-7061.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2011

/Ronald C. Gorsché, Jr./
Ronald C. Gorsché, Jr.
Reg. No. 45,505
Customer No. 60879
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP